COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, March 16, 2017 10:00 AM - 11:15 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT 1501 W. Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-452-3288 AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 31617#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Jonathan Bearup*
Julie Dybas
Christopher Hale
Donald Jacobson (Jessica Cortes*, proxy)
Phillip Knox (Diana Hegyi*, proxy)
Jeff Mangis
Ron Overholt*
Michael Pollard, Chair
Nancy Rodriguez
Paul Thomas

GUESTS

Alexis Allen, *Tempe Municipal Court* Jennifer Gilbertson*, *Phoenix Muni Court* Randy Kennedy, *Scottsdale Municipal Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Janie Randall

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, ITD Cathy Clarich, CSD Denise Lundin, CSD Adele May, ITD Kat Nguyen, ITD Jim Price, ITD

^{*} indicates appeared by telephone

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He confirmed that a quorum existed before he requested consideration of the minutes from the February 16 meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2017 CACC meeting with the addition of the word "software" to the first category description of the four categories proposed for monitoring. The motion passed unanimously.

The chair instructed members to be on the lookout for an e-mail from Kat Nguyen regarding their willingness to serve again for next fiscal year.

COT AD HOC SUBCOMMITEE DISCUSSION

Staff member Stewart Bruner unveiled a preliminary list of potential projects to monitor that he compiled from various sources and mapped into the four categories proposed by the Commission on Technology (COT) ad hoc project monitoring subcommittee:

- 1) Project cost exceeds \$250K for its 5-year software development and operation or
- 2) The project is a dependency for a strategic initiative of COT or
- 3) The project is local but high enough profile it would spawn a headline upon failure or
- 4) The project is necessary to address cybersecurity vulnerabilities

Stewart requested members' input regarding the appropriateness of both the projects included and the categories each was mapped into. Members took no issue with the mapping but requested that all current statewide projects also be mapped into the appropriate categories.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Stewart detailed the various changes made on the MindMap since the February meeting, passing along what information he had received from those project managers who were not present for the meeting. He reviewed each minor date change that has taken place and elaborated on the eBench next county, Cochise, which had detail added. Members were provided the updated priority projects listing for reference.

PROJECT UPDATE: CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Paul Thomas, court administrator for Mesa Municipal Court, stated that Mesa's FARE interface completion has been linked to a city revenue requirement and is therefore a top priority to complete by June 30. He outlined the general plan of action now that Greg Stoner is back on the project, but timing depends on coordination of testing with AOC. Paul requested a new AOC contact after the departure of project manager Barry Johnson.

Adele May, the AJACS limited jurisdiction (LJ) case management system (CMS) project manager, detailed her LJ AJACS rollout strategy for the remaining AZTEC courts in Maricopa County now that three courts have been completed. Work is also underway with the final court scheduled in the Maricopa group, Glendale Municipal Court, far ahead of the typical schedule due to its high case volume and the complexity of court automation that runs in conjunction with AZTEC, affecting local business processes. The remainder of the AJACS update was devoted to

members' discussion of the implications of Rule 11 legislation on case management systems in Maricopa courts and the manner in which LJ courts have been handled by the superior court in dispositioning Rule 11 cases thus far versus the way they will likely be handled going forward.

DETAILED PROJECT REVIEWS

Electronic Records Retention & Destruction (ERR&D) -- Cathy Clarich introduced Denise Lundin then described their approach to the ERR&D project that will be deleting records for cases that are outside the published retention period but still residing in AZTEC, AJACS, OnBase, and local CMSs. Cathy outlined the five main phases of the project then talked through the plan of action for the subset of courts being addressed in each phase. To reduce complexity, only the most common scenarios are being addressed first and Maricopa courts are being deferred until their AJACS rollout completes later this year. Adele verified that the release of LJ AJACS being implemented March 17 weekend contains the automated destruction queue but the queue will not be populated for each court until detailed training first takes place. Use by the general jurisdiction courts will follow their implementation of AJACS Version 6.0.

Cathy also emphasized the lengthy nature of the project based on the need for continued purge cycles for up to 10 years to remove AZTEC cases as they time out following conversion to AJACS. Members discussed ways retention could be managed apart from the AZTEC application, the differences in required retention periods by storage medium, and reasons why a local copy must still be kept for records that exist in the data warehouse at AOC. Jennifer Gilbertson briefed members on Phoenix's testing of deletion triggers with the data warehouse and FARE.

AZTurboCourt/eUniversa Integration – Jim Price briefly described the interaction of AZTurboCourt as an electronic filing service provider in a competitive, multi-vendor, filing model with eUniversa as the electronic filing manager and the ultimate source of AJACS integration for e-filings from any provider. Connecting points all remain the same as used today. The integration project's largest dependency matches eUniversa's: successful integration with AJACS. Jim provided the status of work being performed by Intresys, the vendor for AZTurboCourt and indicated that the company is working hard to go live in Yavapai Superior Court as soon as possible.

Scottsdale SQL Data Feeds – Randy Kennedy, Scottsdale Municipal Court's Automation Manager, briefly outlined a project to switch from an AZTEC-based pull model to an alternative push model from SQL for all existing cases and new cases going forward. It is currently in the initial test phase with AOC to be followed by more extensive testing with Xerox for FARE transactions. Randy detailed the types of cases being tested in each block. No formal completion date has been set, but the project remains on COT's priority list to complete by the end of the fiscal year on June 30.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Since the February CACC meeting

- Carefree/Cave Creek was converted from AZTEC to AJACS.
- AZTurboCourt cut over to the new payment provider, nCourt and ceased operation with PayPal.

• Gilbert's CPOR Feed was restored in October 2016, it turns out.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

The chair requested members' direction about contacting additional project managers for appearance at the April meeting. Stewart opined that the remaining projects were among those that prompted the original request to COT for formal direction. An alternate proposal was made to ask courts to share their distant (beyond the strategic plan document window), revolutionary projects that will be vital to meeting future expectations of the public and justice partners in an environment of ever-decreasing revenues. Stewart listed some sample scenarios related to court automation – appearance in proceedings by anyone from anywhere, full infrastructure outsourcing, automated dispute resolution, minimal-facility courts. Concern was raised that COT would request detailed plans and funding sources for what are purely conceptual projects. Following discussion, the population from which to solicit was limited to CACC and Technical Advisory Council member courts since others generally rely on AOC. The chair asked staff to reach out to Peter Kiefer for a "future trends in courts" update, as he has done for NACM.

The next meeting will take place on **April 20, 2017 at 10:00 AM** at the State Courts Building in Phoenix. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.